

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 10 2005

Appl. No. : 10/056,662 Confirmation No. 9818  
Applicant : Daniel J. Benedict et al.  
Filed : 01/23/2002  
TG/A.U. : 1651  
Examiner : Leon B. Lankford Jr.  
Docket No. :  
Customer No. : 26357

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

NUMBER OF PAGES: 3 (Includes this page)

---

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the  
United States Receiving Office, Fax. No. 571-273-8300 on August 10, 2005.

Typed name of person signing this certificate: Robert M. Hunter

Signature: Robert M. Hunter 42,679  
Tel: 808-885-4194

See enclosed Interview Request form.

Continuation of Issues to be Discussed:

Issues	Claims	Prior art	Discussed	Agreed	Not agreed
112 rej	1-30;36-46	NA	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

AUG 10 2005

PTOL-413A (08-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/056,662 First Named Applicant: Daniel J. Benedict et al.  
 Examiner: Leon B. Lankford Jr. Art Unit: 242 Status of Application: pending

## Tentative Participants:

(1) Robert M. Hunter (2) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: August 19, 2005 Proposed Time: 3 pm ET (AM/PM)

## Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>103a rej</u>	<u>Cl:80-81</u>	<u>All cited</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>103a rej</u>	<u>Cl:82</u>	<u>All cited</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>103a rej</u>	<u>Cl:1-46</u>	<u>All cited</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) <u>103a rej</u>	<u>Cl: 23</u>	<u>All cited</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

## Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

see attached sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Robert M. Hunter

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Robert M. Hunter

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

42,679

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is so file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**Brief Description of the Arguments to be Presented:**

With respect to claim 80, where are the following limitations taught by the references: "filling the reactor of claim 76 with a first portion of said physiologic process solution; circulating . . . ; draining . . . ; refilling . . . ; pausing . . . ; adding . . . ; restarting . . . ; sampling . . . ; . . . cycling . . . "? See MPEP 2173.05(f) and 809.

With respect to claim 82, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "circulating a physiologic process solution through a reactor having a flow loop that connects a digestion chamber into which said pancreatic tissue has been deposited, a sparging vessel and a process pump"? See MPEP 2116.

With respect to claim 1, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "controlling said plurality of process control variables . . . with a process controller . . . wherein said plurality of process control variables include . . . a flowrate, . . . a dissolved oxygen concentration, . . . an antibiotic concentration . . . "? Where in the references are these parameters "recognized"?

With respect to claim 23, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "the dissolved nitric oxide concentration is controlled by a microprocessor controller between 0.000000000000001 moles per liter and 1.0 mole per liter"? Which reference discloses a range that overlaps with the applicant's range as was the case in Boesch et al.? Claims 16, 21, 27, 30, 34, 36 and 39 also recite specific ranges against which no prior art has been cited.

With respect to claim 61, where is the following limitation taught by the references: "a step for controlling . . . a flowrate, . . . a dissolved oxygen concentration, . . . an antibiotic concentration . . . "? Claim 61 contains other specific limitations against which no prior art has been cited.

With respect to the 112 rejection of claim 1, where does the applicant state that "monitoring and controlling of a digestive enzyme is critical or essential to the practice of all embodiments of the invention"? Where does claim 1 exclude the presence of a digestive enzyme from the "islet processing solution"? Would this rejection be withdrawn if the applicant returned the phrase "containing a tissue dissociating compound" to the claim? Does the claim have to recite that the islet processing solution also comprises other components, such as water, salt, hydrogen ions, hydroxyl ions, etc.?